

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are pending after this amendment.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 12, 23, and 34 in order to more particularly define the invention. The amendments were not necessitated by the claim rejections. Applicants make no admission as to the patentability or unpatentability of the originally filed claims.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Damashek, U.S. Patent No. 5,418,951. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

On July 15, 2003, a telephone interview took place to discuss the outstanding Office Action. Participating in the telephone interview were Examiner Leslie Wong and Applicants' representative Amir H. Raubvogel. Claims 1-35 were discussed with respect to the Damashek reference. The Applicants' representative argued that Damashek compares distributions of n-grams within documents, whereas the present invention compares actual strings to find an exact match. Applicants' representative further argued that Damashek seeks to categorize a document according to language, topic, or the like, whereas the present invention performs text equivalencing. Applicants' representative further argued that the present invention forms substrings responsive to not finding a match, whereas Damashek extracts n-grams before performing any comparison. No amendments were proposed. No exhibits were shown nor demonstrations conducted.

On August 6, 2003, another telephone interview took place to discuss the outstanding Office Action. Participating in the telephone interview were Examiner Leslie Wong, Examiner Jean Homere, and Applicants' representative Amir H. Raubvogel. Claims 1-35 were again discussed with respect to the Damashek reference. Applicants' representative restated and clarified the arguments made during the previous telephone interview. Applicants' representative proposed an amendment to clarify that "comparing the modified string with a known string" involves performing a character-by-character comparison of strings. The Examiners agreed that Damashek does not perform such a comparison, and such an amendment would result in withdrawal of the §102 rejection. No exhibits were shown nor demonstrations conducted.

Applicants thank the Examiners for the opportunity to discuss this application. Claims 1, 12, 23, and 34 have been amended in accordance with the proposal discussed during the August 6 interview. These independent claims now recite "performing a character-by-character comparison" of the modified string with a known string in order to locate a match. All other claims in the application depend from claims 1, 12, 23, and 34 and thus incorporate the amended language.


In view of the agreement reached in the interview, Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection be withdrawn. Favorable action is solicited.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss the above amendments, or if the Examiner believes that further contact with Applicants' representative would help to ad-

vance the prosecution of this case to finality, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,
Ted E. Dunning and
Bradley D. Kindig

Dated: August 6, 2003

By: 

Amir H. Raubvogel,
Reg. No. 37,070
Fenwick & West LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (650) 335-7276
Fax: (650) 938-5200